

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on October 19, 2006.

Claims 1, 8 and 9 are amended and claims 18-20 are canceled; as a result, claims 1-14 are now pending in this application upon entry of this amendment.

#### **Withdrawn Claims 18-20**

Claims 18-20 were withdrawn by the Examiner due to constructive election of Group I (Claims 1-14). Applicant does not traverse, but reserves the right to pursue these claims in a continuing or divisional application at a later date.

#### **§101 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 9-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended independent claim 9, from which claims 10-14 depend, directly or indirectly, to specify that the machine-accessible medium is a “tangible machine-accessible medium.” Applicant respectfully submits that a tangible machine-accessible medium is statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-14.

#### **§112 Rejection of the Claims**

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 8 to clarify the claim. This amendment clarifies that the at least one first certificate is not what is being revoked, rather the third party’s delegated ability to utilize the at least one first certificate is being revoked. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment directly addresses the Examiner’s concerns on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the amendment and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claim 8.

### §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-9 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by McGarvey (U.S. 6,643,774). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection but has chosen to make clarifying amendments to both independent claims 1 and 9.

In the previous Office Action Response, Applicant argued that McGarvey fails to teach or suggest a client providing a certificate to an authorizer. The text of this argument is not repeated here, for the sake of brevity. In response, the Office Action explains through the Examiner's reasoning that although the client in McGarvey provides a certificate to the third party and then the third party forwards the certificate on to the authorizer, the end result falls within the language of the claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees, but nevertheless has chosen to amend the independent claims 1 and 9 to remove any misunderstanding of the claims. Amended independent claims 1 and 9 now provide in part, "providing by the client to the authorizer, the at least one first certificate, directly in response to the authorizer accessing the universal resource identifier (URI); . . ." Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment rules out the scenario of McGarvey where the third party receives the certificate and then forwards it on. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that the amended independent claims still read on the asserted scenario of McGarvey, Applicant respectfully requests a proposed amendment in the next Office Action.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 9 are patentable over McGarvey. Claims 2-8 and 11-14 depend, directly or indirectly, from patentable independent claims 1 and 9, respectively, and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Allowance of claims 1-9 and 11-14 is therefore requested.

### §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGarvey in view of Eastlake et al. ("XML - Signature Syntax and Processing").

Claim 11 was also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGarvey in view of Ellison et al. ("SPKI Certificate Theory").

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10 and 11 both depend from patentable independent claim 9 are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, James Hallenbeck at (612) 373-6938, or Applicant's below-named representative to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

VICTOR B. LORTZ

By his Representatives,  
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 349-9592

By / Ann M. McCrackin /  
Ann M. McCrackin  
Reg. No. 42,858